

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/887,044	06/25/2001	Mei-Li Chuang Chien	7401	
7590 08/30/2004			EXAMINER	
Mei-Li Chuang Chien Min-Chih Chuang & Min-Jan Chuang			TRAN LIEN, THUY	
P.O. Box No. 6-57 Chung-Ho City Taipei Hsien, 235 TAIWAN			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1761	
			DATE MAILED: 08/30/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		09/887,044	CHUANG CHIEN ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Lien T Tran	1761			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
THE - Externantier - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing end patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timed within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>25 June 2001</u> .					
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	on of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Applicati	on Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau see the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been receive I (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachmen	t(s)					
2) Notice 3) Information	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 09/887,044

Art Unit: 1761

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1: Line 3, what does applicant mean by "grains of natural fruit"; also, the phrase "uses the grains of natural fruits" is indefinite because it is not clear what is intended by it. The phrase is a processing step and it is not clear how it is related the filling ingredient; it is suggestion applicant uses language such as "a filling ingredient comprising ". Line 5, the phrase "a starch layer is starch" is confusing because it is repetitive; it is suggested applicant uses this language "a starch layer on the filling ingredient"; the term "the outer layer" is confusing because it is not known what outerlayer the claim is referring to. Lines 6-9 are confusing because it is not clear if applicant intends to claim property with the product; the language used is not clear. Limitation such as "a pearl starch ball with filling is composed from the mentioned components" is confusing because the claim already recites the components of the product.

Claim 2 is vague and indefinite; the language "can be grain-shaped and processed five grains" does not positively claims that the filling is grain-shaped and processed five grains. It is not clear what the scope of the claim is. What does applicant mean by "grain-shaped and processed five grains.

Claim 3 has the same problem as claim 2; additionally, the phrase "processed healthy ingredients from Chinese herb medicines" is unclear because it is not known what would considered as such ingredient. The scope of the claim can not be determined.

Application/Control Number: 09/887,044

Art Unit: 1761

Claim 4 has the same problem as claim 1; additionally, what does applicant mean by "grain-shaped fruit jello"?

Claim 5 has the same problem as claim 2.

Claim 6 is vague and indefinite. What does applicant mean by "any mention pearl starch ball product according to claim1"?; claim 1 only recites one starch ball product.

The use of the terms "can be" has the same problem as claim 2. Line 3, the phrase "respectively from the inside to the outside" is confusing; inside to outside of what? Line 2 recites at least more than two layers; however, lines 4-5 only recite two layers.

In claim 7, the phrase "any mentioned pearl starch ball product" has the same problem as claim 6.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the cookbook "Dim Sum".

Application/Control Number: 09/887,044

Art Unit: 1761

The cookbook discloses a recipe for wheat starch dough. The dough is made of wheat starch, tapioca starch, salt, oil and water. The dough is made into a wrap for wrapping various fillings. One recipe teaches wrapping a filling comprising shrimp, meat and vegetable in the dough wrap. Another recipe teaches wrapping a filling comprising meat and vegetable.

The product disclosed in the cookbook comprises a filling ingredient and a starch layer on the filling ingredient. It is unclear if the claims are claiming the filling ingredients as recited. The only positively claimed filling ingredient is natural fruits as recited in claim 1. The cookbook does not teach a filling made of fruits.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to put any kind of filling in the dough depending on the taste and flavor wanted. This would have been an obvious matter of preference. For instance, if the product is intended as a dessert dish, it would have been obvious to use a fruit or some kind of sweet filling instead of meat and shrimp filling. Even if all the filling ingredients in claims 2-6 are positively claimed, the claimed product would still not define over the prior art because it would have been obvious to add any kind of filling depending on the taste and flavor desired. It would also have been obvious to use different layers of filling to obtain different taste and flavor. It would also have been obvious to vary the volume of filling material depending on the amount of filling wanted.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lien T Tran whose telephone number is 571-272-1408. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday.

'n

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

August 26, 2004

LIEN TRAN PRIMARY EXAMINER